

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

|  |   |                           |
|--|---|---------------------------|
| Shenzhen Sunwell Industrial Co. Ltd.           | ) |                           |
|  | ) |                           |
| Plaintiff                                      | ) | Case No: 25 C 1949        |
|  | ) |                           |
| v.   | ) |                           |
|  | ) | Judge: Lindsay C. Jenkins |
| The Partnerships and Unidentified Associations | ) |                           |
| Identified on Schedule A                       | ) |                           |
|  | ) |                           |
| Defendant                                      | ) |                           |

**Order**

Plaintiff's motion for an *ex parte* motion for a temporary restraining order [17], [12] are granted, though the surety bond Plaintiff will post must be in the amount of \$10,000. The Temporary Restraining Order being entered along with this minute order shall also be placed under seal. In addition, for the purpose of the motions cited above, Plaintiff's filings support proceeding (for the time being) on an *ex parte* basis. Specifically, and as noted above, were defendants to be informed of this proceeding before a TRO could issue, it is likely assets and websites would be redirected, thus defeating Plaintiff's interests in identifying defendants, stopping Defendants' infringing conduct, and obtaining an accounting. In addition, the evidence submitted by Plaintiff shows a likelihood of success on the merits (including evidence of active infringement and sales into Illinois), that the harm to plaintiff is irreparable, and that an injunction is in the public interest. An injunction serves the public interest because of the consumer confusion caused by counterfeit goods, and there is no countervailing harm to defendants from an order directing them to stop infringement. Electronic service of process does not violate any treaty and is consistent with due process because it effectively communicates the pendency of this action to Defendants. As other judges in this District have noted, there may be reason to question both the propriety of the joinder of all Defendants in this one action and whether plaintiff will pursue an accounting (which Plaintiff asserts as justification for an asset freeze), but at this preliminary stage, the court is persuaded that Plaintiff has provided sufficient evidence of coordinated activity and the prospect of an accounting to justify the requested relief as to all Defendants. Enter Sealed Temporary Restraining Order.

Date: 3/11/2025



Lindsay C. Jenkins  
United States District Court Judge